



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

10
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/863,037	05/23/1997	BERNARD A. WEINSTEIN	01985-P0032A	4253
7590	01/27/2006		EXAMINER	
DAVID M. ROSENBLATT, ESQ. THE THOMSON CORPORATION METRO CENTER, ONE STATION PLACE STAMFORD, CT 06902			DALENCOURT, YVES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2157

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/863,037	WEINSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yves Dalencourt	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 11-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 12/14/2005.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 11, and 15.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 4 and 11 - 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2157

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, and 14 - 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter et al (US 5787402; hereinafter Potter) in view of Hawkins et al (US 5,497,317; hereinafter Hawkins), and further in view of Cannon et al (US 5,423,086; hereinafter Cannon).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 11, and 15 - 16, Potter et al teaches a method and system for performing automated financial transactions involving foreign currencies (col. 3, lines 48 – 50) which comprises a user computer for specifying a market condition to be monitored and a corresponding client ID via a first telecommunication link (10, figure 1; col. 3, lines 15 – 22; col. 5, lines 50 – 60); an electronic source of updated market data (col. 14, lines 14 - 17); a host computer system including a database for receiving and storing a plurality of the market conditions specified for monitoring and the corresponding client IDs (102, figure 2; col. 13, lines 44 - 50); confirmation data generated and transmitted by said host computer system via a second telecommunication link upon receipt of the specified market condition and corresponding client ID by said database, said confirmation data indicating that the specified market condition has been received by said host computer and will be monitored (col. 14, lines 21 - 27); monitoring program executable on said host computer system for comparing each of the specified market conditions stored on said host computer system and said source of updated market data to determine if a specified market condition is found in said source of updated market data, said monitoring

program generating a signal if a specified market condition is found to exist, the signal indicative of the found specified market condition and the corresponding client ID stored on said host computer system (col. 14, lines 9 - 14); and a transmitter responsive to said signal for transmitting notification of the specified market condition via a communication link (col. 14, lines 14 - 21).

Potter teaches substantially all the limitations including the idea that all messages sent from the client PC to the applications servers, as well the reverse, are channeled through the message router (see fig. 1), wherein the message router also directs messages by and between the applications servers (col. 5, line 60 through col. 6, line 44), but fails to explicitly teach that the transactions are performed in a first, second, and third telecommunication links.

Hawkins teaches, in the same field of endeavor, a device and method for improving the speed and reliability of security trade settlements, which teaches the idea of having several communication links between security trading participants and a central database (col. 4, lines 9 - 64).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Potter by utilizing a first, second, and third telecommunication links to communicate settlement information among security trading participants for the purpose of improving the speed and accuracy of trade settlement, thereby reducing the time required to settle securities trades.

Potter and Hawkins teach all the limitations, but fail to specifically teach that such specified market condition is transmitted via a telecommunication link to a paging

network, said paging network, upon receipt of the notification of the specified market condition and the corresponding client ID, forwarding the notification of the specified market condition to an appropriate portable receiver indicated by the client ID.

Cannon teaches an analogous art, where stocks prices are being received through a paging network in an appropriate portable receiver (see col. 2, line 31 through col. 3, line 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit notification of the specified market condition through a paging network to an appropriate portable receiver in Potter and Hawkins's device as evidenced by Cannon for the purpose of providing reliable delivery of messages while meeting a market need to communicate limited information in wireless environment and with little delay.

Regarding claims 2, 12, and 17, Potter, Hawkins, and Cannon teach all the limitations in claims 1, 11, and 15, and Potter further teaches a program executable on said user computer for providing share price momentum as market condition to be monitored (col. 3; lines 26 - 29).

Regarding claim 14, Potter, Hawkins, and Cannon teach all the limitations in claim 11, and Potter further teaches a computer aided real-time decision support system and method wherein said user computer includes a communication server (44, figure 1; col. 4, lines 54 - 59).

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter, Hawkins, Cannon, as applied to claims 1 and 11, above, and further in view of Vanden Heuvel et al US 5281962; hereinafter Vanden Heuvel).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Potter, Hawkins, and Cannon teach all the limitations in claims 1 and 11, but fail to specifically teach a system wherein said user computer specifies the market condition to be monitored in electronic mail format.

However, Vanden Huevel et al teaches, in an art related field of providing information to users, a reliable information service message delivery system wherein said user computer specifies the market condition to be monitored in electronic mail format (col. 3, lines 24 - 38) for the purpose of reliably delivering information service messages to communication receiver in a communication system.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a system wherein said user computer specifies the market condition to be monitored in electronic mail format in Potter, Hawkins, Cannon 's system as taught by Vanden Huevel for ease of use and also to reliably deliver information service messages to communication receiver in a communication system.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hawkins et al (US Patent Number 6,029,146) discloses a method and apparatus for trading securities electronically.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (571) 272-3998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6: 00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt

January 8, 2006